

19306

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 15, 1977

parts in the House to discuss this entire problem. Committee members agreed that U.S. participation in parliamentary conferences can, if properly conducted, produce great practical benefits in terms of both diplomacy and education, and that potential value of such participation can be more fully realized if procedures are developed which foster increased and more effective attendance. In regard to the criticism sometimes leveled at Senators and Congressmen who attend such meetings abroad, the Committee agreed that Congress as a whole ought to be prepared to affirm the value of such meetings and to participate in them actively and without apology.

Sec. 458. Foreign Gifts and Decorations

The purpose of this section, which was initiated by Senator Biden, is to strengthen the provisions of the Foreign Gifts and Decorations Act of 1966.

The U.S. Constitution does not prohibit the acceptance of gifts and decorations under all circumstances but does require that Congress consent to their acceptance. In the Act of 1966, Congress consented to U.S. Government employees retaining foreign gifts of minimal value and also decorations for outstanding and meritorious service. Concerning a gift of more than minimal value, however, the Act made acceptance permissible only if refusal would likely cause embarrassment or adversely affect the foreign relations of the United States. Such gifts, according to the Act, are to be considered the property of the United States and to be used or disposed of according to regulations issued by the President.

In 1974 the Foreign Relations Committee requested the General Accounting Office to review the administration of the 1966 Act, and after a year-long study the GAO issued a report pointing out a number of deficiencies in the Act and its implementing regulations. "Records GAO has examined indicate that some Government officials may have received gifts which, up to the present, have not been reported to the Chief of protocol. GAO was unable to ascertain whether these were isolated instances or representative of a more general problem of a lack of reporting.

"The reporting system under the Act relies heavily on voluntary compliance by the recipient. Neither the Act nor its regulations requires that gifts be reported within a specific time, nor is there an effective penalty for noncompliance.

"Individuals receiving gifts often are in the higher civil service grades or hold elective or high appointive positions. GAO noted a reluctance on the part of the Office of Protocol to approach such individuals concerning requirements of the Act.

"Regulations do not explain that the Act applies to gifts given by officials of any foreign governmental subdivision, not solely national governments.

"Regulations fail to explain that all gifts, whether given as a personal or state gift, are under the provisions of the law.

"Neither the regulations nor the Act state whether or not gifts from foreign quasi-government organizations or multinational organizations need to be reported.

"Neither the Act nor its regulations requires an independent appraisal of the gifts. The burden of determining a gift's worth—'minimal value' defined as \$50 or less—rests with the recipient.

"Once a gift is reported to the Chief of Protocol, he may permit its use for official purposes or declare it excess personal property and transfer it to the General Services Administration for disposition. The Chief of Protocol was unable to locate all gifts, indicative of inadequate control.

"The Act does not apply to experts and consultants hired by the Government."

The GAO concluded that the Act should be strengthened and submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee draft legislation

which provided the basis for this section. In amending the 1966 Act, this section provides as follows:

That gifts of more than minimal value must be reported by the recipient to his employing agency and deposited with the U.S. Government within 60 days of receipt; for penalties for failure to report and deposit such gifts (up to \$1,000 fine or one year in jail);

for coverage of per diem experts and consultants;

for the application of the Act to foreign quasi-governmental and multilateral organizations;

for independent appraisal of gifts and for their disposal by (a) return to giver, or (b) donation, transfer, or sale in accordance with existing law (including negotiated sale, perhaps to the original recipient);

for the acceptance of intangible gifts from foreign governments (travel, housing, etc.) of more than minimal value when the benefit accrues to the United States Government;

for the acceptance of decorations or awards for meritorious performance, subject to the approval of the employing agency;

for a change in the definition of minimal value to \$100 to reflect inflation (the current law is silent but present regulation set minimal value at \$50);

for an annual publication in the Federal Register of all gifts registered to the various branches of Government;

that no gifts of more than minimal value shall be given by the U.S. Government using appropriated funds unless specifically authorized by Congress or unless purchased from a specified State Department account; that all such gifts of more than minimal value purchased using appropriated funds, and also any gifts which did not involve the use of appropriated funds, shall be annually reported to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House International Relations Committee; and

for the Secretary of State, through U.S. embassies, to inform foreign governments "that it is the general policy of the U.S. Government to prohibit U.S. Government employees from receiving foreign gifts or decorations of more than minimal value."

In approving these new and more stringent rules and procedures governing the giving and receiving of gifts, the Committee emphasized several points:

(1) Gifts of more than minimal value which have been deposited with the various "employing agencies" should where possible be officially used or displayed, and the sale of such gifts should in most cases be the last recourse. If a gift is to be displayed, priority should be given to display by governmental agencies, including state and local, and also by municipal museums.

(2) For gifts forwarded to the General Services Administration for disposal, procedures should insure an evaluation at fair market value and not below.

(3) The Committee strongly disapproves of an officer or employee of the U.S. Government giving to any foreign recipient any gift which has been provided by a private U.S. citizen or business firm. Through the annual report required by this section, the Committee intends to determine the extent and nature of this practice, and to take corrective action as appears necessary.

Sec. 459. Strengthening Information, Cultural, and Radio Activities

The purpose of this section, which was initiated by Senator Percy, is to establish certain broad principles which should govern a reorganization of the State Department and USIA in the area of information and cultural activities, and to require the President to prepare and submit to Congress by October 31 of this year a reorganization plan taking into account the findings of recent studies on this subject.

The section draws a distinction between

two foreign policy functions: (1) "policy articulation," which is the explanation and defense of U.S. foreign policy in this country and abroad; and (2) "cultural activities," which involve a variety of programs and activities designed to foster understanding of the United States on a more general, long-term basis. Both functions are now being performed in both State and USIA.

The underlying premise of the section is that the two functions are best performed separately, and that this can be brought about through a reorganization which places all "policy articulation" responsibilities in the State Department and responsibility for the administration of "cultural activities"—such as the exchange-of-persons programs, libraries, information centers, exhibitions, magazines, and motion pictures and television activities—in a new agency based upon what is now USIA.

In addition, the section states that radio broadcasting by the Voice of America is actually a combination of three functions: the transmission of objective, reliable news and also the two functions cited above—policy articulation and the promulgation of general information about American society in its diversity and as a whole. The section states that these potentially (and sometimes actually) conflicting functions can best be reconciled—and the stature and credibility of VOA enhanced—if the Voice of America has a clear mandate to broadcast accurate, objective, and comprehensive news, to represent American society in its totality, and to provide such air time as is necessary for the articulation by executive branch spokesmen of official United States policy. The section also calls for a strengthening of VOA broadcasting, in terms of both transmitter power and number of languages broadcast.

The overall approach to State-USIA reorganization set forth in this section is consistent with—but less specific in detail than—the conclusions drawn by the "Stanford" Panel on International Information, Education, and Cultural Relations (a privately-funded study), and the "Murphy" Commission on the Organization of the Government for the Conduct of Foreign Policy (which was a Government-funded study mandated by the Congress). The Committee intends—and this section instructs—that in the preparation of the Administration's plan, consideration be given to the reports of both groups and also to the reports, completed and published just this month, of the General Accounting Office and the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information.

Although this section calls for the President to submit his plan to the two foreign affairs committees by a specified date, the Committee—and particularly the Subcommittee on International Operations—anticipates consulting regularly with Administration officials, both formally and informally as the plan is being prepared. Exactly what procedure the Committee will follow once the plan is submitted will be determined by these consultations and the plan which results.

Sec. 460. U.N. Conference on Science and Technology for Development

This section, which was initiated by Senator McGovern, is self-explanatory:

(a) The President shall take appropriate steps to insure that, at all stages of the United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development, representatives of the United States place important emphasis, in both official statements and informal discussions, on the development and use of light capital technologies, especially in agriculture, in industry, and in the production, conservation, and use of energy.

(b) As used in this section, the term "light capital technologies" means those means of production which economize on capital wherever capital is scarce and expensive and labor abundant, the purpose being to insure